

REMARKS

As Applicant is filing a RCE herewith, it is respectfully requested that this amendment be entered and considered at this time.

Applicant will address the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner continues to reject Claims 28, 31-32 and 36 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Yamazaki et al. (US 6,140,667). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 28, 32, 37 and 41 to recite:

placing the substrate in a cooling room after the crystallization;

(see e.g. p. 6, lns. 20-21; p. 15, lns. 3-12 of the present application)

cooling the crystalline semiconductor film by ~~applying~~ supplying a first cooling gas into the cooling room after the crystallizing; (see e.g. p. 15, lns. 6-13; Fig. 6)

and

placing the substrate in the cooling room after the gettering; (see

e.g. p. 6, lns. 20-21; p. 18, lns. 14-21)

cooling the crystalline semiconductor film by ~~applying~~ supplying a second cooling gas into the cooling room after the gettering. (p. 18, lns. 15-21; Fig. 7)

These amendments clarify that the cooling steps of the claimed invention are intentionally performed by placing the substrate in a cooling room and supplying a cooling gas into the cooling room.

In contrast, Yamazaki '667 in col. 12, lns. 30-35 and Fig. 18 (cited by the Examiner in the Final Rejection) merely discloses cooling periods.¹ Yamazaki '667 does not disclose or suggest the specific steps of cooling using a cooling room or by supplying cooling gases, as in independent Claims 28, 32, 37 and 41 of the present application.

Accordingly, Yamazaki '667 does not disclose the claimed invention, and the claims are patentable thereover. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner also continues to reject Claims 29-30, 33-35 and 37-44 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki '667 in view of Udea et al. (US 6,337,259). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons discussed above, these claims are also not disclosed or suggested by Yamazaki '667.

The Examiner also cites Udea. Applicant, however, could not find any discussion of cooling in the reference. The Examiner cites the abstract, col. 6 lns. 10-30 and col. 5 lns. 25-33 of Udea in support of his rejection. However, each of these sections appears to discuss gettering, not cooling, and using nitrogen and helium during gettering, not cooling. Hence, Udea also does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention, and even

¹ The Examiner appears to base his rejection on the term “applying” in the claims. Accordingly, Applicant has amended this term to now recite “supplying.” This should overcome one of the Examiner’s basis for this rejection.

if it were combined with Yamazaki '667 (which Applicants do not admit would be proper), the combination still fails to disclose or suggest the claimed invention (e.g. suggest the specific steps of cooling using a cooling room or by supplying cooling gases).

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of the present application are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

August 15, 2005



Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 000026568